



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

same position, when they are not. Dr. Green, of course, holds that the pentateuchal document P is of Mosaic origin. Some modern critics have argued, however, that it betrays its late (that is, exilic or post-exilic) date by the presence of words of Aramaic form and meaning. When, now, Dr. Driver is quoted as demolishing this particular evidence, it does not follow that he also favors the Mosaic date. Yet, again and again, the reader is allowed to get this impression, until one who knows Dr. Driver's position is almost forced to ask: "What is this that is come unto the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?"

Here and there discussions are introduced that seem foreign to the purpose of the book. Such is the long quotation, pp. 47-54, wherein Dr. Driver shows that the late date of P cannot be proved from the preponderance in that document of *אני* over *אנכי*. This is really a problem in historical, and not in textual, criticism. On the other hand, it is surprising, in a book of this character, to find no reference to the remarkable differences between the Massoretic and Septuagint texts in their respective accounts of the introduction of David to the court of Saul. Speaking of the Septuagint, one may venture the opinion that few modern scholars can be found who, for critical purposes, place so low a value on this version and on the Samaritan Pentateuch as Dr. Green does, especially when the two happen to agree against the Massoretic text, which, as everyone knows, has attained its present fixedness by the rigorous suppression of variant manuscripts.

The fanciful derivation of "sincere" from *sine + cera*, "honey without wax," is given by Dr. Green, though this derivation is regarded as untenable by modern etymologists. A little more careful proof-reading would have noted the frequent omission of the point that distinguishes *ש* from *שׁ*, as well as many broken or omitted vowel-points.

PHILIP A. NORDELL.

BOSTON, MASS.

DAS BUCH KOHELETH UND DIE INTERPOLATIONSHYPOTHESE SIEGFRIEDS. Eine exegetische Studie. Von PROFESSOR LAUE, Lic. theol. Wittenberg: P. Wunschmann's Verlag, 1900. Pp. 28. M. 0.60.

THE book of Ecclesiastes is unique in its difficulties among the books of the Old Testament. Kleinert, Delitzsch, Volck, and other

commentators have recognized that the material that composes the chapters in the middle of the book is disconnected and loosely strung together. Some manifest contradictions also have been discovered. Wildeboer (*Lit. d. A. T.*) emphasizes the dualism of the book as seen in the vacillation between "theism" and pessimism. Still other theories have been advanced to explain its seeming contradictions. This little brochure was written to examine the theory of Siegfried (*Handkommentar zum A. T.*; II: "Die poetischen Bücher," 3, 1898), who finds it impossible to accept the unity of the book. It bears the marks of many hands. It was not compiled from several sources as the Pentateuch, but a basal text has been worked over by several successive writers, who from their individual points of view have attempted to correct the ideas of their predecessors. The author of the basal text was Q I, a philosophical pessimist, the beginning, middle, and end of whose discourse were: "All is vanity." Neither wisdom nor pleasure, neither wealth nor work, brings profit. The next redactor, Q II, was not a radical opponent of Q I, but belonged to that Sadducean circle which did homage to Epicureanism. Mere pleasure to him was an illusion, but life was beautiful and sweet, and genuine satisfaction was found in pleasurable thought. Q III was the wise man to whom may be attributed the wisdom section of the book. Q IV was the pious (*chasidh*) redactor who discussed the *Theodiceeproblem*. The combined result of the above writers has been interpolated by the whole school of the wise; these scattered glosses are designated by Q V. Laue carefully examines the grounds for Siegfried's analyses and announces, mainly on sound principles, that Q I and Q II cannot be entirely separated, that Q III as defined cannot be entirely separated from Q I, nor can Q V be everywhere distinguished from Q I. Q IV, however, seems to correct Q I, and to furnish a solution of the problems of Q I. Laue sees in Q IV the real editor of the book who furnished the conclusion of the whole matter. But in literary and exegetical character Koheleth, though the early chapters are carefully worked out, must be regarded as a torso. It presents only a fragmentary conclusion of the many questions suggested, leaving an impression of incompleteness and non-satisfaction. Laue's examination presents at least the danger of over-analysis and of magnifying minor difficulties into elaborate hypotheses.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.